



CITY OF ATLANTA

Kasim Reed
Mayor

SUITE 1900
55 TRINITY AVENUE, SW
ATLANTA, GA 30303
(404) 330-6204 Fax: (404) 658-7705
Internet Home Page: www.atlantaga.gov

DEPARTMENT OF PROCUREMENT
Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM, CPP
Chief Procurement Officer
asmith@atlantaga.gov

January 30, 2015

Dear Potential Respondents:

Re: FC-7885, New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities

Attached is one (1) copy of **Addendum Number 3**, which is hereby made a part of the above-referenced project.

For additional information, please contact Krista A. Morrison, Esq., at (404) 865-8709 or by email at kamorrison@atlantaga.gov.

Sincerely,


Adam L. Smith

ALS/kam

ADDENDUM NO. 3

This Addendum No. 3 forms a part of the Request for Information and modifies the original solicitation package and any prior Addenda as noted below and is issued to incorporate the following:

- **A total of 24 Questions and Answers (see pages 4-9).**

The Information Statements due date has NOT been modified and Information Statements are due on Wednesday February 4, 2015 and should be time stamped in no later than 2:00 P.M. EST and delivered to the address listed below:

Adam L. Smith, Esq., CPPO, CPPB, CPPM, CPP
Chief Procurement Officer
Department of Procurement
55 Trinity Avenue, S. W.
City Hall South, Suite 1900
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

****All other pertinent information is to remain unchanged****

Acknowledgment of Addendum No. 3

Respondents must sign below and return this form with Information Statements to the Department of Procurement.

Respondents must sign below and return this form with Information Statements to the Department of Procurement, 55 Trinity Avenue, City Hall South, Suite 1900, Atlanta, Georgia 30303 as acknowledgment of receipt of this Addendum.

This is to acknowledge receipt of **FC-7885, New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities Addendum No. 3** on this the _____ day of _____, 20__.

Legal Company Name of Respondent

Signature of Authorized Representative

Printed Name

Title

Date

Questions and Answers

- 1) Can you explain in more detail what should be contained within "Possible market values" and "Differentiation between revenue and citizen benefits" as requested in RFI (Exhibit B, 3.0 section)?

Answer: Possible market value should reflect what the respondent believes the City might receive with respect to revenue in today's economic environment, net of any required investments. For the purposes of the RFI, revenue would refer to net revenue dollars the City would receive as a result of a specific initiative. Citizen benefits are non-monetary benefits that could include but are not limited to: services (ex: bike share), convenience (ex: easier to use XYZ), beauty (ex: public art), events (ex: concerts), technology (ex: Wi-Fi) or information (ex: nearest transit station).

- 2) As we begin our work on the RFI we are in great need of information on how to assess the quantity and location of current public waste and recycling receptacles.
- a. Existing Trash open bins map request:
 - i. Number and location of public waste located in Downtown, Mid-Town, Buckhead and certain high profile Parks, etc.
 - ii. Number and location of public recycling units in Downtown, Mid-Town, Buckhead and certain high profile parks, etc.
 - b. Who is responsible for servicing these stations?
 - c. Do you have existing routing information we can use as a baseline for our expected savings models?
 - i. Routes schedule, how many times per week?
 - ii. FTE to run those routes?
 - iii. Average FTE annualize cost?
 - d. Our assumption is that this data exists, likely with Dept. of Public Waste, Park group, Business Improvement Districts, etc.?
 - i. Can you assist with providing this data or broker an immediate meeting with right department to access the information? This is critical to providing sound revenue estimate relative to advertising potential.

Answer: For the purposes of the RFI and to demonstrate a proof of concept, please use any metrics or base any assumptions on comparable cities you have worked with. The purpose of the RFI is not to provide the most accurate figures, but to demonstrate viability and order of magnitude of benefits. Information reflected in public records may be obtained through an Open Records Request to the appropriate agency.

3) You have omitted certain locations - why?

- i. Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport;
- ii. The Department of Watershed Management;
- iii. Atlanta Police and Fire;
- iv. Atlanta Public Schools;
- v. Centennial Olympic Park;
- vi. The new Falcons Stadium;
- vii. The Atlanta Beltline; or Any other privately held amenity

Answer: The locations were left out of consideration for a variety of reasons including: enterprise funded entities, separately or privately held or operated locations, or concerns regarding possible perception of public safety services.

4) Are there current Advertising relationships with either the targeted areas or omitted areas that we need to be aware of or sensitive to?

a. It appears that many of the major players are here already. Do you have an Advertising contacted vendor of choice /preference established? Please confirm the existence of advertising contracts currently in place outlined below:

- i. Lamar (billboards), yes/no term –

Answer: Not that the City is aware of.

- ii. Clear Channel (billboards, airports), yes/no term

Answer: Not that the City is aware of.

- iii. Out Front (formerly CBS Outdoor), yes /no term

Answer: The City is currently a recipient of revenue derived from MARTA's existing bus shelter contract with Out Front (formerly CBS Outdoors). The City has a "Partnership Agreement" with MARTA that will last 15 years from the effective date of January 1st, 2008.

FC-7885, New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities

Addendum No. 3

January 30, 2015

Page 6

- 5) Will the specific financial details describing potential revenue or savings outcomes -- including financial assumptions describing a participant's proposal/recommendations -- be made available through the RFI process to other bidders, or will our response remain solely between the City of Atlanta and Respondent?

Answer: Any submissions sent through the City's RFI process are public records.

- 6) Section 4.0 states that several "areas" shall not be considered in developing statements for the City. Will you be sharing the responses with those departments and districts? Have any expressed interest already?

Answer: City departments will be using the responses for further research and possible procurement, legislation and implementation. However, as responses are public record, the departments or areas not considered for RFI solicitation may view responses and choose to contact the City seeking information or partnerships.

- 7) Is a property/park excluded from the scope if it is on the National Register of Historic Places? That is the case for the 100+ year-old Olmsted Linear Park.

Answer: The City will respect all current policies and requirements of historical and landmark designations.

- 8) The March bond referendum Frequently Asked Questions document identifies a number revenue generation strategies that will be used to meet the annual debt payments for the proposed infrastructure bond, including "new revenue initiatives." Is it assumed that this RFI is one of those revenue initiatives? Are there other new revenue initiatives that are also being explored in addition to this initiative?

Answer: Yes, the City is also pursuing other possible revenue generating initiatives outside of the RFI.

- 9) The bond referendum FAQs document estimates annual debt payments will be approximately \$16.5M annually. Recent news coverage (Creative Loafing 12/3/2015) suggests the goal is to identify \$20M (annually) and that "up to \$5M" could come from branding efforts (according to Emily Lieb, Senior Project Manager). Please confirm the MOID's overall revenue goal as well as the revenue goal targeted through New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities.

Answer: The expected bond repayment is approximately \$16.5M annually, however, this number may fluctuate due to financial market conditions, and thus the City is looking to identify \$20 million in cost savings, efficiencies, and new revenue. Numbers quoted in the press as targets are possible outcomes; however, projections, both City wide and department specific, will remain tentative until all respondents have submitted their ideas and the review committee has assessed all opportunities.

FC-7885, New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities

Addendum No. 3

January 30, 2015

Page 7

- 10) Is the revenue goal targeted through New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities a fixed amount through the life of the bond or does it increase over time? What is the revenue goal targeted for 2015-2016 budget cycle?

Answer: Due to ramp up periods, the City expects that the goal for new revenue will increase over the course of the program. City Council has not yet authorized the 2015-2016 budget cycle.

- 11) What is the revenue goal targeted specific to parks? Will any of those dollars be used to support the parks in which the revenues are generated?

Answer: Please see question 9 in reference to targets. The City is considering a strategy to reserve some portion of funds driven by department specific assets to remain with those departments.

- 12) The RFI (Exhibit B) states that the goal of this initiative is to "generate revenue and/or provide new citizen amenities/services supported by innovative methods (including marketing and sponsorship)." Considering these goals as separate areas of inquiry, how would you prioritize? Simply revenue generation? Revenue generation paired with new citizen amenities/services? New citizen amenities/services that cover costs but do not generate additional revenue?

Answer: As the RFI is meant to solicit a wide variety of ideas, the City is not able to provide a formula for how it will evaluate each initiative. The City will be utilizing an inter-departmental review panel to evaluate ideas with preference being given to concepts that achieve "Triple Bottom Line" goals.

- 13) As new citizen amenities/services are explored, will maintenance costs related to new amenities or services be the responsibility of the provider or will they add to the maintenance costs of parks and other city departments?

Answer: While each initiative will be evaluated individually, revenue should be calculated as net revenue [revenue-costs] with the City preferring that maintenance and ongoing upgrades be the responsibility of the partner organization, not the City. The general terms of required maintenance should be addressed in proposals by respondents.

- 14) If this initiative was thought of as a portfolio, what percentage of each category would comprise the whole?

Answer: Please see question 9 regarding targets.

- 15) Is the Innovation Team and the Procurement Office aware of the Parks Department's signage package and how sponsors can currently be acknowledged for large donations in parks? Will this new initiative use the Parks Department's signage package or will the signage package be updated based on the outcome of this new initiative?

Answer: Currently the City is not contemplating revising the Department of Parks and Recreation signage package.

FC-7885, New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities

Addendum No. 3

January 30, 2015

Page 8

- 16) Is the Innovation Team and Procurement Office aware of those parks that have specific investments that include branding and recognition (i.e., basketball court at Central Park, fitness stations at Little Nancy Creek sponsored by Children's Healthcare of Atlanta, football fields at Anderson Park and Ben Hill funded by the NFL Foundation). Will the City's efforts to explore new revenue generation opportunities honor these and other agreements that are in place?

Answer: Yes and yes.

- 17) Is the Innovation Team and the Procurement Office aware that park conservancies have MOUs that have established protocols for sponsor and donor recognition as well as existing agreements with large private company foundations and private corporations to fund both conservancy operational costs and park improvements? Will the City's efforts to explore new revenue generation opportunities honor the MOUs that are currently in place?

Answer: Yes and yes.

- 18) How will historic designations (in those parks that are designated as historic) limit the opportunities for new marketing and partnership opportunities?

Answer: The City will respect all policies and requirements of historical and landmark designations.

- 19) Are there any state or local laws that will limit the use of billboards or other outdoor advertising in or around City parks?

Answer: Yes, there are current City and State ordinances that restrict new electronic billboards to industrial zones.

- 20) How will citizen input from the RFI be incorporated during the RFI submittal review process?

Answer: The City will be utilizing an inter-departmental review panel to evaluate ideas with preference being given to concepts that achieve "Triple Bottom Line" goals. Citizen input will be provided directly to the panel.

- 21) How will citizen input from the RFI be incorporated in advance of the RFP process?

Answer: The purpose of the RFI is to help craft the construction of the RFPs themselves.

FC-7885, New Marketing and Partnership Opportunities

Addendum No. 3

January 30, 2015

Page 9

- 22) How will the Parks Department, Park Pride and park conservancy staff (including Atlanta Memorial Park, Chastain Park, The Conservancy of Historic Washington Park, Grant Park, Historic Fourth Ward Park, Olmsted Linear Park Alliance, Piedmont Park, South Fork Conservancy, and Woodruff Park) be engaged in the process during the review of the RFI submittals?

Answer: The City's policy dictates that only City employees may directly be involved with internal procurement review. Any parks-specific input will need to be represented on the review committee by DPRCA designees.

- 23) How will these entities be engaged in the process during the review of the RFP submittals?

Answer: Please see the answer to question 22.

- 24) As the concept of multiple RFPs is considered, is there a possibility that efforts related to parks might be evaluated and implemented by a review team led by the Commissioner of Parks and Recreation and supported by senior Parks Department staff, citizens and nonprofit park experts?

Answer: Yes this is a possibility, however, please see question 22 regarding non-employee involvement in official procurement processes.